

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 379

August 9, 1995, 7:09 p.m.  
Page S-12055 Temp. Record

## TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS/Mass Transit Operating Funds

**SUBJECT:** Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 2002.  
Hatfield motion to table the Specter/Santorum amendment No. 2328.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 68-30

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, H.R. 2002, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will appropriate \$12.4 billion in new budget authority (BA) for the Department of Transportation and related agencies, and will set the obligational ceiling for the Highway Trust Fund at \$17.0 billion. In total the bill will provide \$36.265 billion in budget authority, trust fund ceilings, and exempt obligations, which is \$1.987 billion less than requested by the Administration.

**The Specter/Santorum amendment** would increase the amount appropriated for Federal mass transit operating assistance by \$40 million in BA and by \$24 million in outlays for fiscal year 1996 (the bill will provide \$400 million in BA; \$700 million was provided in fiscal year (FY) 1995). The offsets would include the following: \$5 million in both BA and outlays from General Service Administration rental payments; \$10 million in BA and \$6 million in outlays from Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) research and development; and \$5 million in BA and \$3 in outlays from the Department of Transportation working capital fund.

During debate, Senator Hatfield moved to table the Specter/Santorum amendment. A motion to table is not debatable; however, some debate preceded the making of the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

Last year, mass transit operating assistance was reduced by 12 percent. This year, the President asked for a 30-percent, across-the-board reduction, and the House approved a 44-percent, across-the-board reduction. The Senate bill before us will also make a 44-percent reduction, but it will ease the burden on smaller communities by cutting funding for assistance to communities

(See other side)

YEAS (68)			NAYS (30)		NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (41 or 77%)	Democrats (27 or 60%)		Republicans (12 or 23%)	Democrats (18 or 40%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Ashcroft	Helms	Akaka	Abraham	Biden	Mack <sup>-2</sup>	Bradley <sup>-4</sup>
Bennett	Hutchison	Baucus	Burns	Dodd		
Bond	Inhofe	Bingaman	Chafee	Feingold		
Brown	Jeffords	Boxer	Cohen	Harkin		
Campbell	Kassebaum	Breaux	D'Amato	Kennedy		
Coats	Kempthorne	Bryan	DeWine	Kerry		
Cochran	Kyl	Bumpers	Lugar	Kohl		
Coverdell	Lott	Byrd	McConnell	Lautenberg		
Craig	McCain	Conrad	Santorum	Levin		
Dole	Murkowski	Daschle	Specter	Lieberman		
Domenici	Nickles	Dorgan	Thompson	Mikulski		
Faircloth	Packwood	Exon	Warner	Moseley-Braun		
Frist	Pressler	Feinstein		Moynihan		
Gorton	Roth	Ford		Pell		
Gramm	Shelby	Glenn		Robb		
Grams	Simpson	Graham		Sarbanes		
Grassley	Smith	Heflin		Simon		
Gregg	Snowe	Hollings		Wellstone		
Hatch	Stevens	Inouye				
Hatfield	Thomas	Johnston				
	Thurmond	Kerrey				
		Leahy				
		Murray				
		Nunn				
		Pryor				
		Reid				
		Rockefeller				

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business  
2—Necessarily Absent  
3—Illness  
4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea  
AN—Announced Nay  
PY—Paired Yea  
PN—Paired Nay

with populations of less than 200,000 by 20 percent, and by cutting assistance for larger communities by 48 percent. In making this distinction, the appropriators were admitting one of the points being made by the sponsors of this amendment--cuts in mass transit operating assistance disproportionately hurt smaller communities, because, with their smaller ridership base, that assistance makes up a greater proportion of their revenues.

Still, we cannot support this amendment. Passing it would raise false hopes that this program will continue. It will not; it is scheduled to be eliminated entirely within 7 years. The reason for eliminating it is budgetary; cuts have to be made, including from worthwhile programs, in order to balance the budget. If we fail to balance the budget, all programs will be worthless because the country will be bankrupt. The decision has been made to eliminate mass transit operating assistance and other programs as well because they are not of sufficiently high priority. We can no longer afford to fund everything--in fact, we can afford to fund very little. Voting in favor of this amendment would send a false signal that it has been given a reprieve; we will not send that signal, and must therefore, reluctantly, vote to table it.

**Those opposing** the motion to table contended:

Mass transit is oftentimes a lifeline for lower income Americans to escape from Government dependency. The sponsors of this amendment became very sensitive to this fact as many of the old, industrial steel towns in Pennsylvania lost their factories, and their workers needed mass transit funding to get to those places where jobs could be found. Many of these towns were small, and relied almost entirely on a single employer. Without that employer they suffered from enormous unemployment rates. The mass transit that existed thanks largely to Federal subsidies proved enormously useful for these workers as they searched for new employment. Mass transit is frequently thought of as a benefit for big cities, but the rail assistance that the Government provides is greater per capita for areas with fewer people. Smaller transit systems, with fewer riders, rely on the Federal Government to cover up to 20 percent of their costs. Large city systems, in contrast, rely on the Federal Government to pick up 4 percent of their costs. Federal subsidies are not the only subsidies received; therefore, our colleagues should not be misled into believing that eliminating Federal aid would result in fare increases of only 4 to 20 percent. Instead, based on estimates we have seen from Pennsylvania, the cuts in this bill alone will result in fare increases in some places of up to 100 percent.

When we have met with low-income workers and people on welfare, we have not found a great desire for more handouts. People want to be self-sufficient. They do not want help that keeps them trapped. Over and over, we have heard that the most important thing that we can do for them is to ensure reliable, affordable transportation to places where they can work. The Specter/Santorum amendment would not give them this guarantee. We concede that it would only make a modest restoration in the very large cut in Federal funding for mass transit assistance. It is, though, a step in the right direction, and on that basis we are pleased to give it our support.